

Spring 5-6-1992

## Senate Meeting, May 6, 1992

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, May 6, 1992" (1992). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 608.  
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/608>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 6, 1992

Volume XXIII, No. 14

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of April 22, 1992

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEM:                      Approval of Student Appointments to  
University Programming Board Committees

INFORMATION ITEMS:              None

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

May 6, 1992

Volume XXIII, No. 14

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

### **ROLL CALL**

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 22, 1992**

Senator Zeidenstein: Page 9, under Communications, second and third sentences should read: "These amendments would be proposed in lieu of the Rules Committee's Proposed Bluebook Changes. For my reasons see page 17 of the minutes of the last meeting."

XXIII-96 Motion to approve Minutes of April 22, 1992 by Borg (Second, Razaki) carried on a voice vote.

### **CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Chairperson Schmaltz noted the announcement in the Senate packets regarding College Election Results for University Appeals Committee and University Review Committee:

#### **University Appeals Committee**

1995 TERMS

Tom Ellsworth, CJS

Marilyn Kasa, HSC

Julian Dawson, Music

Carl Eckberg, History

#### **University Review Committee**

1993 TERM

Dave Kephart

1995 TERMS

George Palmer, Milner Library

Don Armstrong, Music

Hiroshi Matsuoka, Physics

Chairperson Schmaltz wished the students well on their finals, and the faculty members well on correcting those exams.

#### **VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS**

Vice Chairperson Shimkus: I would like to wish everyone a good summer.

#### **SBBD PRESIDENT'S REMARKS**

Student Body President Randy Fox: I wish everyone a good summer and will see you in the Fall.

#### **ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS**

President Wallace had an excused absence.

(Provost Strand distributed copies of the State of Illinois Board of Higher Education Guidelines for Productivity Improvements in Illinois Higher Education dated May 5, 1992.)

Provost Strand: I would like to inform the members of the Senate about an exercise in which the Illinois Board of Higher Education has asked each of the public colleges and universities to engage. It is a productivity improvement exercise. Arthur Quern, the Chairperson of the Board of Higher Education, feels that it is important that public higher education in Illinois introspectively examine itself and find out in what ways we might become more efficient. To that end, there are twenty-five guidelines from the Board of Higher Education that we, as an institution, need to address. We are asked to prepare a report that is to be submitted to the Board of Higher Education by October 1, 1992. I mention this topic specifically this evening because the timeline that the IBHE has identified for us will require a great deal of activity to take place over the summer when the Senate is not meeting. I have distributed to you this evening a copy of the guidelines which describe the types of activities in which we will be engaging. I will make certain that the appropriate Senate committees and the Senate Executive Committee are made aware of what is happening and the attempts to respond to this exercise. I did not want the Senate to reconvene in late August or early September and find out that we have had to do some of this over the summer and be dissatisfied with the fact that the Senate did not know about it in advance. The reason that the Senate did not find out about it before this evening is that the Board of Higher Education just met yesterday to solidify the elements of this exercise. The type of report that we will submit will be an indication of what types of productivity measures we might implement after the next fiscal year. We will try



to address ways in which we can become more efficient in what we are doing. One of the premises from which we will begin this exercise is that ISU is one of the most underfunded state universities. This circumstance notwithstanding, the IBHE is expecting each institution to respond. All of the reallocations that we have done in the past don't count. If institutions do not do this exercise themselves, seriously, then someone else will do it for them. I wanted the Senate to be aware that I will be keeping individuals and committees informed of the progress we are making and we will have full information for the Senate in the fall.

Senator Walker: Is this the same effort as the one from the Board of Higher Education that asks us to look at duplication of programs between universities?

Provost Strand: Yes. That is part of it. What the IBHE is saying is that it may not be wrong to have five or twelve programs in one area, but we need to examine to what extent there is a reason for the existence of the program, rather than just continue on with it.

Senator Walker: Will there be an attempt for universities to get together to analyze their programs, or will the IBHE make their own determinations?

Provost Strand: There will be an opportunity for institutions to consult with one another to the extent that that is possible within the time frame. However, that is not mandated. I would expect that there will be dialogue after the fact rather than before it. One of the aspects that we need to verify is that there is more than the numerical value of the data considered. There have to be other considerations to factor in the process. According to Dr. Arthur Quern, the Chair of the IBHE, it is better to complete the exercise at the institutional level, rather than from the top down. Obviously, it will be a very sensitive exercise. Each institution is going to have to demonstrate how it will respond more effectively and efficiently.

Senator Walker: Is it more than just academia, are support services involved?

Provost Strand: Yes, it is more than an academic area exercise. However, there is a preponderance of emphasis in the academic area. Also, there are some questions that deal with ways in which the staff of the IBHE is to examine the types of reports which they require from campuses. Some of those reports may be redundant, unnecessary, unreasonable, or uneconomical.

Senator Hesse: Are private institutions like Bradley who also receive funding from the IBHE asked to do the same exercise.

Provost Strand: No.

Senator Pomerence: How much of this will be done in departments and college levels?

Provost Strand: Part of this exercise will interrelate with the review of scope and mission that is going on now in many of the colleges. But, the extent to which it will affect a particular department will be shared with those faculty members who are available in the summer. I would imagine that there will be a flurry of activity in August to make sure that (1) the information is known; and (2) examining programs for inclusion in the exercise.

Senator Zeidenstein: These IBHE guidelines do not define productivity. I hope those concepts can be clarified before the study is attempted.

Senator White: Is there going to be a relationship of this exercise with the President's Committee of 27?

Provost Strand: Hopefully, there is a relationship between the mission statement, the strategic plan, the review of scope and programming, and a myriad of other activities that are on-going. However, this report is to be developed in brief paragraphs to document how productive programs and particular areas are. The final format of this report in October will have no relationship to any other exercise. Hopefully the substance in the paragraphs and items referenced will be traced back to these antecedent documents.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Prior to recognizing the Vice President for Student Affairs, I would like to point out a situation that occurred. Two Senators: Senator Razaki and Senator Thomas wrote a letter to the President asking him to comment on a specific issue. The President could not be here this evening. The normal procedure would have been to let this matter go until the next Senate meeting. That would not be until September. It did not seem that this was the appropriate course of action. Since the question involves the area of Student Affairs, Vice President Gurowitz has agreed to try to answer the question.

Vice President for Student Affairs Gurowitz read the letter addressed to President Wallace from Senator Shailer Thomas, and Senator Khalid Razaki: "It has been reported to me that a student was found to be selling an examination administered in an accounting class. It has also been reported that despite two

recommendations for disciplinary action through the SCERB processes these recommendations were overturned and a much milder sanction substituted by the Vice President and Dean of Students. The theft and sale of examination materials violates the Student Code of Conduct and is a most serious breach of the integrity of the university. Please address this serious issue at the Academic Senate meeting May 6, 1992."

The sale of examinations does violate the Student Code of Conduct. I, too, believe that we must have an effective and just judicial system. Last fall I initiated a review of the Student Code of Conduct. The committee working on this should have a report in the fall. I have asked the review committee to look at issues of academic integrity. I have had a number of appeals this year. I do not want to diminish the role of SCERB. The class syllabus stated that students could not remove exams from the room. It did not say anything about a student remembering the exam after they left the class. Several students developed a study guide which was almost identical to the exam. The student involved did not stand to benefit academically from the study guide, since she had already finished the course. This course makes its final exams available for students to study.

Senator Zeidenstein: My class syllabus does not say anything about "Do not remove tests from class." I just assumed that was the same as "not starting a fire in the middle of a lecture." Am I to assume that unless I list all the ten commandments in a syllabus, including "thou shalt not commit arson during an examination," that students can do anything that is not specifically prohibited in the syllabus? Is that the fundamental premise of the decision, that unless the syllabus specifically states something, it is all right?

Chairperson Schmaltz: I think before we get into this too far, it was not the Chair's preference that the discussion take place in this format. But, since this is what senators wanted, this is what is going to take place. However, it is certainly not the role of the Senate to retry the case. I also don't think it is the role of the Senate to discuss confidences of the case. It would be better to keep the discussion on a general level. I don't know what the role of the Senate is. If it is simply to answer the question, that is one thing. If it is to retry the case, that is inappropriate. It is also inappropriate to rewrite the student code on the floor of the academic senate.

Senator Zeidenstein: I was not asking to rewrite the student code. I was not asking for a revelation of confidences. I was asking whether every teacher in this university has now

been put on notice that anything not specifically enumerated in his syllabus which under common tradition is a violation of academic behavior is going to be essentially unchained. Do I have to list every conceivable "misdemeanor," nevermind a high crime in the academic world in my syllabus? If I have to re-write my syllabi, I want to be appraised of that.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I don't know who could answer that for you.

Senator Gurowitz: The syllabus would say "students should not remember/reveal the exam." There are other courses where teachers state this. If your intent is to give the same exam, it would be good to so state.

Senator Zeidenstein: I just learned that there is something else that I am supposed to put on my syllabus. But, I Doubt that I will.

Senator Razaki: I felt that this was the proper forum to bring up this issue, because it is my understanding that the Senate deals with academic issues. Also, SCERB is a creature of the Senate. I told Senator Gurowitz before that I thought it involved academic dishonesty and lack of integrity, especially because this is specifically acknowledged in so much notoriety on this campus and in the community. I guess academic integrity is like pornography -- you know what it is when you see it. This is a clear violation of academic integrity. I am very opposed to the decision that was taken. I would like to see the decision overturned. I did not know how to go about doing it. I felt that the Senate should discuss this and express their opinions. If everything has been done according to policy, maybe we should change the policy.

Senator White: Why did the President direct this particular issue to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs? This is an academic problem. It seems the appropriate place this should have gone is the Provost's Office, not Student Affairs. I don't have experience with this, how is this usually done? Do you ordinarily get such academic issues from the President? Does the Provost ever get such academic issues? How is this usually accomplished?

Senator Gurowitz: I don't know how this has been done in the past. As Vice President for Student Affairs, this is my first academic integrity issue. I only receive appeals of suspension or dismissal.

Provost Strand: First of all, in the eight years I have been in the Provost Office, I have never had a case come to me involving

academic affairs. It has been traditional that the Vice President for Student Affairs has taken care of it. Dr. Gurowitz informed me about this after he had made his decision. He and I talked about the fact that there had been no prior consultation. We agreed that in the future there would be consultation with me before a decision involving academic affairs was made. Even though he may be the designated person to handle the case. I have also taken it upon myself to write to Dr. Willard Moonan who has been designated as Chair of the Committee that is looking at the Student Code of Conduct. I have made a few suggestions to him: (1) The Student Code of Conduct should be examined to make sure that its language is inclusive enough to cover academic integrity, so that it would not require Senator Zeidenstein and other faculty members to put that specific statement in their course syllabus. The Student Code of Conduct should be inclusive enough to address matters of academic integrity. I have asked Dr. Moonan and his committee to examine this. Further, I have asked that the Student Code of Conduct specify specifically that in those cases of academic integrity or academic dishonesty that should the President's designee be other than the Provost, a consultation with the Provost take place. I do not question Dr. Gurowitz's decision, but it pertains to the position (whether he is here or I am here) -- a good way to avoid this in the future would be to codify that in the Student Code of Conduct.

Senator White: It is not possible for your office to be the designated office to deal with this type of situation?

Senator Gurowitz: I would want to talk to Provost Strand if it was an academic situation.

Senator Kaiser: Given the fact that two boards voted to take punitive action against this student, was there some overwhelming or compelling reason to override the decision. Did you find something in their decisions faulty?

Senator Walker: Point of order. Are we not trying to retry the case? I believe we should stick to the Student Code Book, Page 46, number 13: "Decisions resulting in sanctions other than suspension or dismissal are final after appeal to SCERB. Decisions resulting in suspension or dismissal may be appealed to the President of the University through a designated representative. Such an appeal must be received within ten days of SCERB's decision." -- whether or not the steps of authority have been followed or not, not retry the case.

Senator Kaiser: Well, the original question was: The theft and sale of examination materials violates the Student Code of Conduct and is a most serious breach of the integrity of the university." and Senator Zeidenstein's concerns about the issue

address the policies and reason for over-turning the decision.

Senator Walker: I guess I would argue that the Senate only needs to be concerned with number 13, whether or not the proper chain of command in the University was followed in overturning the decision in this case.

Senator Razaki: I think Senator Kaiser has a right to question the process. Two judicial bodies made a decision on this, and for some reason the decision was overturned.

Senator Zeidenstein: Perhaps if we rephrased the question: Was there a compelling reason to overturn the decision?

Senator Gurowitz: In reading all the documents, the student did not intend nor was there a violation of academic integrity. It was not her intention to reveal the contents of the examination.

Senator Kaiser: Under the Student Code of Conduct, Page 44, Item One: "Written or other work a student submits in a course must be the product of his/her own efforts: Plagiarism, cheating, or other forms of academic dishonesty are prohibited."

Senator Schmaltz: It all depends on how you interpret that first sentence. "Written or other work a student submits in a course must be the product of his/her own efforts:" The next three phrases refer to the work the student submits. I think that is the way Senator Gurowitz is interpreting it. It is not outlawing other forms of academic dishonesty, it is only outlawing other forms of academic dishonesty in regard to "written or other work a student submits in a course...."

Senator Kaiser: There is a very fine line here. You have two types of cases: in one case a student passes on class notes to other students in a study group, and they share information and help one another. In another case, a student passes on examination questions to other students -- that is "cheating." In our department, the examination booklet states: "Cheating or taking the final examination from this room is grounds for dismissal from the university." I think this case is clearly a case of cheating.

Senator Walker: Did you overrule my point of order.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes, as long as we don't discuss the specifics.

Senator Zeidenstein: On page 44, of the Student Code of Conduct, paragraph 5 states: "A student shall not appropriate for



his/her own use public/private property not his/her own without the consent of the owner or the person legally responsible."

I would think an examination would be considered public or private property of the instructor. Apparently, the student appropriated the property for his/her own use -- not to mention the fact it was sold to other students. On page 46, section 13, that Senator Walker mentioned, I have a question on the second sentence: "Decisions resulting in suspension or dismissal may be appealed to the President of the University through a designated representative." I read that as saying the President considers what to do with the appeal. He received the appeal through Dr. Gurowitz. I would like to know if the President delegated his authority to act upon an appeal to his representative?

Senator Gurowitz: Yes.

Senator Thomas: Somebody here has clearly committed an act of academic dishonesty or an academic no-no. I was dismayed by what my colleagues in the university told me about the milder sanction that the Vice President for Student Affairs substituted for the SCERB decision. I would like to ask Dr. Gurowitz if this is a different type of decision than others to come before SCERB. Have there been other Vice Presidential actions that have overturned SCERB decisions on academic dishonesty? Is this a change in educational philosophy at this institution?

Senator Hoffmann: Did the professor hand the exam out to the whole class? It is like giving a child a piece of candy and telling him he can't eat it.

Senator Walker: Point of order. I think the senator has misinterpreted the case.

Senator Gurowitz: I don't believe that the professor handed out the exam. During a regular examination in the class, students remembered the questions and reproduced them after the class.

Senator Razaki: What happened is that in Accounting 131, we have three multiple choice examinations and one final examination. The final is a comprehensive examination. To study for the final examination, students are allowed to look at their three previous exams and see which ones they missed. They are not allowed to remove the exams from the building. A group of students divided up the questions and reconstituted the exam and sold it as a study guide for \$35.00.

Senator Rabah: These test questions are ones that students have already seen -- it is not fresh material?

Senator Razaki: The exam was sold to people who were not in the class.

Senator Rabah: It was sold to people who were not in the class? If they were in the class, they would have taken the test at some point in time before.

Senator Razaki: No. Let me explain what happened. The student took the course, say in the Spring semester. After the semester is over, you reconstitute the final examination and other students who are taking the class in the Fall will buy it as a study guide. The student made a financial gain from selling the examination.

Senator Thompson: There was only one person who sold the examination?

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Chair has expressed the opinion that we should not get into the specifics of the case because it would take the next nine or ten hours to retry it. I have in essence been told by my faculty colleagues through their questioning that they want the specifics of the case brought out. I have student senators, once you get into the theory, want the specifics of the case brought out. The chair is not going to be accused of squelching this issue, trying to shut it down, or anything like that. I am prepared to sit here until 4:00 a.m. in the morning discussing the specifics of the case as long as people choose to want to do that. Therefore, I will allow Senator Razaki to answer that question.

Senator Razaki: The student advertised the study guide for sale in a flyer posted in the library. It read: "Beat the Accounting 131 System....." and listed the name and phone number of the student who was tried for selling the examination. The student refused to divulge the names of other students.

Senator Newgren: If I were a student, I think I would have two concerns about this issue: (1) A concern about the administration overturning a decision of the Student Code Enforcement and Review Board; and (2) A concern about the guidelines of a study group, what is appropriate as far as sharing of materials, etc.

Vice President for Business and Finance Alexander had no remarks.



## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **1. Approval of Student Appointments to University Programming Board Committees**

XIII-97 Motion by Shimkus to approve student appointments to the University Programming Board Committees (Second, Stock) carried on a voice vote.

#### **Entertainment Committee**

Tracey Cornish  
Brent Edmonson  
Kevin Gross  
Gloria Harris  
Brian Krotser  
Joseph Kumor  
Dennis Lambert  
J. Edward McBride  
Chris Miller  
Kelly Mulcahey  
Crystal Nebel  
Rick Mirs, Alternate  
Earl Van Dusen, Alternate

#### **University Forum Committee**

Sara Attig  
Jennifer Booker  
Edward Coit  
Amy Dellos  
Collin Summers  
Connie Schwartz  
Laura Long  
Amanda Eubanks, Alternate  
Carla Cavaletti, Alternate

#### **Student Center Policy Board**

Stacey Hughes  
Rob Kress  
Lawanda Lewis

#### **Student Center Programming Board**

Rob Beck  
Donna Bower  
Kelly Codner  
Samuel Kong  
Kate Loeffler  
Stacey Miller  
Todd Morrison  
Jennifer Randag  
Mary Ryan

Frank Saracceno  
Dayton Smith  
Jeremy Hill

Senator Borg: It would help to have the department names and majors listed for each student.

Senator Walker: Didn't the Senate stipulate a few years back that the student's department, major, and GPA be listed?

Chairperson Schmaltz: Not in writing. We do list that for the Athletic Council.

Parliamentarian Cohen: The screening form that the student fills out has that information on it, as well as their grade point.

Senator Schmaltz: These students apply to be on these committees, and are then screened by the University Programming Board.

#### **NO INFORMATION ITEMS**

#### **NO COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No report. Senator Paul Walker asked to meet with the chair of Administrative Affairs Committee following the Senate meeting.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No report.

**BUDGET COMMITTEE** - No report.

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No report.

**RULES COMMITTEE** - No report.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE** - No report.

#### **Adjournment**

XIII-98 Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Razaki) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**JAN COOK, SECRETARY**

Volume No. XXIII No. 14